

**REMARKS**

The Examiner rejected claims 1 - 33 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,392,712 issued to Gryshiewicz that describes a system for synchronizing interlaced and progressive video signals. In contrast, the invention as recited in claim 1 describes a configurable video processor that provides a single, synchronized video stream to a display from any number of incoming video streams each having different formats. In addition, the invention as recited in claim 1 provides for bi-directional communication between a network and the video processor. More particularly, claim 1 recites:

"a number of ports each of which is configured to receive one of the video streams wherein at least one of the ports is a network interface that provides a bi-directional link between network applications and data provided by a network and the real time video processor."

At no time does the cited reference Gryshiewicz teach or remotely suggest bi-directional communication with a network since Gryshiewicz is only concerned with synchronizing interlaced and progressive video streams. Gryshiewicz never discusses any bi-directionality for providing a communication link with a network, packet based or otherwise. In particular, the Examiner cites Fig. 6 to support the anticipatory rejection in "that Official Notice is taken of the fact that cable set top boxes with user interfaces connected to a network are well known in the art." at page 5 item 13. However, at column 9, lines 26 - 39, "particularly for applications where the progressive video signal 130 is a graphic overlay, to be added upon the incoming video data stream 120..." and at column 9, line 45 (referring to Fig. 6), "while the interlaced video stream 120 is received from outside the system." In this way, it is clear that Gryshiewicz does not discuss nor even remotely suggest that the video stream 120 originates in the system and is output to a network.

Therefore, the Applicants believe that claim 1 is not anticipated by Gryshiewicz and requests that the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection thereof.

Independent claims 12 and 23 recite essentially the same limitations as does claim 1 albeit as a method and computer program product and are therefore also allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. All remaining pending claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 12 and 23 and are also allowable.

### CONCLUSION

The Applicant believes that claims 1 – 33 are not anticipated by Gryshiewicz and in view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable. Should the Examiner believe that a further telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Michael J. Ferrazano  
Reg. No. 44,105

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(650) 961-8300